DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 569 CS 508 084

AUTHOR Russell, Bruce W.
TITLE The Effect of Computer-Generated Instructional Feedback and Videotape on the Speaking Performance of College Students in a Basic Speech Course.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 21p.; Revised version of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (78th, Chicago, IL, October 29-November 1, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Analysis of Variance; Communication Research; Communication Skills; *Computer Managed Instruction; *Feedback; Higher Education; *Speech Communication; *Student Evaluation; *Teacher Response; Undergraduate Students; *Videotape Recordings

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of a computer-generated feedback system when used in conjunction with an analysis of videotaped performances of students' speeches and model speeches. Subjects, 112 university students enrolled in 9 sections of a required undergraduate public speaking course, were randomly assigned to 1 of 4 groups: group 1 received handwritten feedback before viewing their videotape; group 2 received handwritten feedback after viewing their videotape; group 3 received computer-generated feedback before viewing their videotape; and group 4 received computer-generated feedback after viewing their videotape. Each student was required to give five informative or persuasive speeches during the semester, the speeches increasing in length from one to two minutes for the first speech to six to seven minutes for the fourth speech and returning to the one-to-two-minute length for the fifth and final speech, which could be either persuasive or informative. Results indicated that: (1) the construct of modeling speech behavior and self-analysis of speech performance improved those speech skill traits that were easily observed, such as style, vocal, and gestural qualities; (2) the computer feedback method was more helpful than the handwritten feedback method in improving those observable speech skills; (3) neither treatment appeared to be significantly better in improving speaking skills on the non-observable speech skills of organization and development; and (4) receiving instructor feedback before or after self-analysis of the videotaped speech performance did not significantly benefit either treatment group on improving speech skill. (Five tables of data are included; 32 references, a chart presenting rating criteria, sample rating sheets, and a sample evaluation form are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354569

THE EFFECT OF COMPUTER-GENERATED INSTRUCTIONAL FEEDBACK AND VIDEOTAPE ON THE SPEAKING PERFORMANCE OF COLLEGE STUDENTS IN A BASIC SPEECH COURSE

Bruce W. Russell, Ph. D.
Department of Communication
Slippery Rock University
Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bruce W Russell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Revision of paper presented at the seventy-eighth annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association in Chicago, Illinois
October 29 - November 1, 1992

CS508084

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Speech education teachers are always seeking the most effective method for providing feedback that will develop speaking skill. Used properly, these methods motivate students to improve their speaking abilities. However, this task requires both a significant amount of time and expertise. Time is needed to observe, record, reflect, and respond to the students' performances and expertise is required to accurately observe, evaluate, and respond in a constructive manner. With the advent of television and the availability of personal computers, the possibility now exists to combine these media to provide timely, consistent, comprehensive feedback, and to streamline the evaluation process. The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of a computer-generated feedback system when used in conjunction with an analysis of videotaped performances of the students' speech and model speeches. The study investigated the relationship between the method and time of instructor feedback provided to the student and their subsequent performance on successive speaking assignments.

Considerable research has been conducted to determine the effectiveness of different methods of providing feedback. Book (1985) suggests giving positive comments first, followed by possibilities for improvement, and ending with a note of praise. Cooper (1984) stated that the more complete, immediate, and thorough the feedback, the greater the degree of speech skill that will be developed. Young (1974) found that students rated atomistic, impersonal, positive comments more helpful than holistic, personal, negative comments. Book and Simmons (1980) found that students prefer atomistic over holistic and impersonal over personal peer comments.

When an instructor provides feedback is also a question for consideration. Should each speaker receive simultaneous feedback as the speech is delivered, or should they receive comments after each speech, or at the end of the class period? All of these alternatives have been studied. So what is the most effective approach to supplying student speech evaluations?

Amato & Ostermeier (1967) found that providing simultaneous "unfavorable" feedback created a decrease in delivery qualities. Nyquist & Wulff (1982) discovered that simultaneous verbal feedback works best when directed toward areas identified by the speaker as needing improvement. Behnke & Beatty (1979) used computers to generate simultaneous feedback on a computer monitor. Qualitative measures of student satisfaction were very positive but no quantitative measures of observable speech skills were reported. Dedmon (1967) argues that criticism should be provided after a speech or at the end of the class period. Miller (1964) reported that immediate feedback had a negative effect on succeeding speakers. Hence, providing simultaneous or immediate feedback may have a negative effect on the beginning speaker.

Many articles have been written concerning the effectiveness of electronic feedback in public speaking courses. Several studies have examined the negative effects of unguided viewing of speech performances. Hung and Rosenthal (1981) found that providing delayed, unguided feedback via videotape replay usually resulted in poor results. According to Dowrick (1983), if an individual observing his/her own performance without directive feedback or recognition of areas of improvement, self-observation can diminish an observer's perceptions of his/her own abilities. Diehl, Breen, and Larson (1970) found that not offering beginning speaking students help in viewing their videotaped speech

performances results in more non-fluencies, but determined that improvement increases when the instructor takes the time to point out the errors. Sorenson and Pickett (1986) found similar results: without instructor mediation and explanation, little improvement occurs. McCroskey and Lashbrook (1970) found similar results: viewing without feedback can be counter-productive to the goals of the course.

Studies have also examined the effectiveness of utilizing videotape to understand and observe the actions upon which the instructor criticism is based. Frandsen, Larson, and Knapp (1967) discovered that students who received instructor feedback "after" viewing their speech performance showed significant correspondence with the instructor's ratings of the speech. McCroskey and Lashbrook (1970) studied the effect of using videotape replay of speech performance and instructor evaluations on students meeting course goals. They found that the use of video and instructor feedback helps students meet the course goals better than students who either view their speech performance without criticism or receive criticism without the videotape. Videotape playback which is accompanied by instructor and student discussions can make a positive impact on the student's perception of the communication process, and on the speech content. Klinzing and Klinzing (1984) studied the effects which self-confrontation via television and additional training have on the "indirectness" of future secondary school teacher trainees. The results indicated that self-confrontation with discrimination analysis and micro-teaching with feedback has the greatest effect on improving upon indirectness. Research appears to suggest that providing videotape feedback with instructor comments does improve speech performance.

One technique employed to improve speech performance involves the use of model speeches. There has been considerable research on the benefits of corrective feedback and modeling. According to Vasta (1976), feedback which permits the most improvement relies on corrective modeling. Corrective feedback serves to improve the behavior identified, and it increases the observer's monitoring of new activities. Bandura (1965) found that when positive reinforcement or incentives are incorporated, the learned activity is quickly converted into performance. Carroll and Bandura (1985) also discovered that brief delays in observing replays of one's performance can reduce the informative value of the self-evaluation. Therefore, it would appear that positive, atomistic, impersonal, corrective feedback should be supplied in a relatively short amount of time to the student before viewing and/or critiquing the videotape.

With the development and availability of computers for individual instructors, there is now the possibility to combine computers and video, and provide students with even more appropriate and more timely feedback. With the aid of the computer, an instructor can develop theory-based comments. Comments that can be written on an impersonal level that address the strengths and weaknesses of an observed skill with recommendations for improvement. Several studies have investigated computer-managed instruction and feedback in speech performance (Behnke and King, 1984; Behnke and O'Hair, 1984; Behnke and Sawyer, 1986). These studies indicated there was positive student interest and/or satisfaction with the method of feedback (Pace, 1987). None have investigated whether computerized feedback improves student speaking performance to a greater extent than does the traditional handwritten method.

Hence, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the "timing" in which students receive feedback (immediate/delayed), with respect to their viewing of their videotaped speech, and the "method" of feedback which they receive (handwritten versus computer-generated). Since the research has indicated that student speech performances improve with positive, impersonal, and atomistic instructor comments supplied before a self-evaluation of a videotape, the following two hypothesis were tested:

Hypothesis I: Students who receive computer-generated feedback from their instructor will demonstrate significantly greater speaking skills, as measured by mean scores assigned by trained raters using the Pier Oral Communication Assessment Scale (POCAS), than students who receive handwritten feedback from their instructor.

Hypothesis II: Students who receive instructor-feedback before viewing videotapes of their speech performance will demonstrate significantly greater speaking skills, as measured by mean scores assigned by trained raters using the Pier Oral Communication Assessment Scale (POCAS), than students who receive instructor feedback after viewing videotapes of their own speech performances.

METHOD

The study entailed a 2x2 design, with the timing of feedback (before or after viewing videotape) as one independent variable, and the form of feedback (computer-generated versus handwritten) as the other independent variable. There were four treatment groups in the study. Treatment Group One received handwritten feedback before viewing their videotape (HB); Treatment Group Two received handwritten feedback after viewing their videotape (HA); Treatment Group Three received computer-generated feedback before viewing their videotape (CB); Treatment Group Four received computer-generated feedback after viewing their videotape (CA).

PARTICIPANTS AND SAMPLING PLAN

The participants for this study were 140 University students enrolled in nine sections of a required undergraduate public speaking course during the fall term of 1990. The participants signed a research consent form and were randomly assigned to groups. Sixty seven were male and 73 were female. Their ages ranged from 18 to 62, the mean was 19. Five groups of seven (35 students) were assigned to each of the four treatments.

The randomization was confirmed by an ANOVA of the performance on the first speech. The results showed no significant difference among the four treatment groups.

Fourteen students were lost to attrition, and due to video difficulties 14 students were not videotaped and therefore had to be dropped. One hundred and twelve students (52 males, 60 females) completed the study, 28 participants in Treatment Group HB; 33 participants in Treatment Group HA; 26 participants in Treatment Group CB; and 29 participants in Treatment Group CA.

Nine different faculty were assigned to the nine sections. Three classes scheduled at the same hour would meet as a large group for some team taught lectures and in individual classrooms for speech presentations. All nine sections used the same syllabus, text and test material.

PROCEDURE

Classroom and laboratory facilities.

The classrooms were equipped with a remote controlled television camera and microphone Each subject's speech was videotaped along with the speeches of the other six members of their group. The instructors videotaped all students in a full length shot so that all body actions could be observed during videotape replay. Students were requirõed to view their speech performances in a videotape viewing laboratory.

Speaking assignments and classroom procedures.

Each student was required to give five speeches during the semester. The first speech was a one to two minute informative speech on an assigned topic. The second was a three to four minute informative speech on a topic of the student's choice. The third was a five to six minute informative/persuasive speech on a topic of the student's choice. The fourth was a six to seven minute persuasive speech on the same topic as speech three. The fifth speech was a one to two minute informative or persuasive speech on the most important concept they learned in public speaking. It was similar in length and structure to the first speech of the course.

Students were assigned to groups and given class time to discuss each speech assignment and topics. The groups were assigned speaking dates and the speech assignment, objectives, and evaluation form were reviewed by the instructor. A model videotaped speech, provided by the text publisher, was also shown to introduce the assignment.

The members of each group presented their speeches on the same day and were recorded on one videotape. At the end of each class those students who were assigned to a "before" treatment groups were instructed that their tape would not be available for viewing until the instructor had completed and returned their speech evaluation. When the evaluation was returned the students were instructed to review their videotape and return their self-evaluation form within one week (See Appendix B).

Those students in the "after" treatment groups were instructed to go to the videotape laboratory and immediately review their tape. After the instructor received the self-evaluation form, the student was given the instructor's feedback.

Those students who received handwritten feedback received their instructor's comments written on the speech objective sheet (See Appendix C). Those students who received computer generated feedback received a computer printout of the instructor's comments. This printout was generated by selecting appropriate comments from the computer bank of comments and merged into the speech objective list.

Development of the feedback comments.

The instructor feedback comments were developed on an atomistic basis, with specific comments developed for each of the 18 speech objectives. The nine faculty involved in the study met to review each of the objectives and identified specific observable speech performances that would indicate the students had met all the criteria for each objective. The instructors were asked to write each comment in a format that would describe what was observed, how well the observed performance met the speech objective, and what feedback should be given to the student if he/she: (1) met all the criteria in an excellent manner; (2) met all the criteria in a superior manner; (3) met all

the criteria in a competent manner; (4) met all the criteria in an inadequate manner; and (5) met the criteria in a poor manner.

A total of 212 comments were collected, reviewed, and entered into the computer. Each comment was entered under the appropriate speech objective and given a "field" code number. After viewing a speech an instructor who was supplying computer-generated feedback to a student would enter the appropriate "field" code number(s) on the speech evaluation form, and a student lab employee would enter the codes, merge the comments and print out an evaluation sheet for each student speaker. The speech evaluations were then returned to the instructor for distribution.

RATER TRAINING

Measurement of the dependent variable, speech skill, was quantified by five trained faculty raters who viewed and rated videotaped speeches, using the Pier Oral Communication Assessment Scale (See Appendix A). The raters were trained in the use of the POCA Scale in three, one hour sessions. The raters were asked to view a group of seven videotaped speeches. This videotape was randomly selected from one of the 15 groups that were not involved in the data collection for this study. One week later the raters and the researcher met again to evaluate the same set of speeches. The mean inter-rater reliability of the raters was $\underline{r}5 = .93$. The mean intra-rater reliability of the raters on the successive viewings of the speeches was $\underline{r}5 = .89$.

Unfortunately, three faculty members were unable to complete the project and three communication seniors were hired to replace them. They were given training sessions in the same manner as were the faculty members and viewed the same pilot videotapes on two successive weeks. Results of their evaluation revealed variability and two student raters were abandoned.

The mean inter-rater reliability of the remaining two faculty and one student rater was $\underline{r}3 = .84$. The mean intra-rater reliability of the three raters was $\underline{r}3 = .88$.

MEASUREMENT OF THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The dependent variable, speech skill, was measured through use of the POCA Scale. Measurement of the five dimensions of speech skill found on the scale (Organization, Development, Style, Vocal Quality, and Gestural Quality) is achieved with a five-point Likert scale. A score of one (1) representing exceptional; two (2), representing superior; three (3), representing competent; four (4), representing inadequate; and five (5), representing poor. Measurement of the dependent variable, speech skill, was obtained by having the raters evaluate videotapes of the fifth and final speech given by each subject. Using the POCA Scale, the judges viewed and rated each subject's videotaped final speech.

Since there is a lack of conceptual agreement concerning speech competence measurement instruments, the Pier Scale was utilized because of its high content validity. Acknowledging that validity is situation specific, this instrument provides very high content validity for this specific course and this specific population.

Data collection.

The data were collected from the rater's evaluations of the videotapes of the first and last speeches. The first tapes were used for a pre-test and the last tapes were used to measure the treatment effects. The rater's evaluations were on a scale from one to five,

where a score of one (1.00) is excellent. Therefore, the lower the score, the better the performance.

RESULTS

An ANOVA was used to examine the impact of "method" and "time" of instructor feedback on final speech scores of the four treatment groups. For the analysis of Hypothesis One, the type of feedback, the scores of the "handwritten" treatment groups were combined and treated as one group identified as (HBA) and were compared to the scores of the combined "computer-generated" treatment groups, identified as (CBA). The analysis indicated no significant difference of the main effect or interaction effect of "method" and "time" on the "Total" speech score of the treatment groups. Therefore, the hypothesis was not accepted. (See Table 1).

TABLE 1. Between Factor ANOVA of Main Effect with "Time" and "Method".

Effect	F	df	p
Time x Method	.104	1,333	.748
Time	.240	1,333	.625
Method	3.614	1,333	.058

There also was no significant interaction effect found on the five individual elements of the POCA scale. (See Table 2).

TABLE 2. Interaction Effects: Between Factor ANOVA with "Time" and "Method" for the Five Elements of the Pier Oral Communication Assessment Scale.

Element	F	df	p
Organization	.421	1,333	.517
Development	.002	1,333	.968
Style	.425	1,333	.515
Vocal Quality	.022	1,333	.882
Gestural Quality	.538	1,333	.464

The analysis of the five individual elements for Hypothesis One on the POCA scale indicated no significant difference between the "handwritten" and "computer-generated" treatment groups on the elements of Organization, Development, and Style. A significant difference was found however, on Vocal Quality and Gestural Quality. The "computer-generated" treatment groups' mean score was significantly better than the "handwritten" treatment group on both elements. (See Table 3).

TABLE 3. Hypothesis One: ANOVA of Handwritten and Computer-Generated Treatment Groups for the Five Elements of the Pier Oral Communication Assessment Scale.

Element	F	df	p
Organization	.391	1,333	.532
Development	.829	1,333	.363
Style	3.505	1,333	.062
Vocal Quality	4.633	1,333	.032*
Gestural Quality	8.814	1,333	.003*

* $p < .05$

For the analysis of Hypothesis Two, the time at which the feedback was provided, the scores of the "before" treatment groups were combined and treated as one group identified as (HCB) and were compared to the scores of the combined "after" treatment groups, identified as (HCA). The analysis indicated no significant difference of the main effect on the "Total" speech score of the treatment groups. Therefore, the hypothesis was not accepted. (See Table 1).

The analysis of the five individual elements on the POCA scale indicated no significant difference between the "before" and "after" treatment groups on Organization, Development, Vocal Quality, and Gestural Quality. A significant difference was found however, on Style. The "before" treatment groups' mean score was significantly better than the "after" treatment group. (See Table 4).

To determine the effectiveness of the treatments used during the study an ANOVA was used to measure participant improvement from the pre-test to the post-test. A significant difference was found between the combined post-test scores of all four treatment groups' "Total" speech scores compared to their combined pre-test "Total" speech scores. The most improvement was made by the (CA) treatment group. This group improved almost one entire rating point on the five point Likert scale. (See Table 5).

TABLE 4. Hypothesis Two: ANOVA of Before and After Treatment Groups for the Five Elements of the Pier Oral Communication Assessment Scale.

Element	F	df	p
Organization	.404	1,333	.526
Development	1.696	1,333	.194
Style	5.843	1,333	.016*
Vocal Quality	.007	1,333	.931
Gestural Quality	2.415	1,333	.121

* $p < .05$

TABLE 5. Mean Scores and Gain Scores of the Combined and Individual Treatment Groups on Pre-test and Post-test Speeches.

Treatment Groups	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Gain Score
Group Total	15.04	14.55	0.49
Handwritten Before	15.11	14.56	0.55
Handwritten After	14.90	14.88	0.02
Computer-generated before	14.90	14.69	0.21
Computer-generated after	15.11	14.12	0.99

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The conclusion drawn from this study is that the treatments used in this study were effective in improving speech skill performances during the course of the study. The total scores improved for all groups. The computer treatment groups demonstrated more improvement than the handwritten treatment groups.

Neither hypotheses tested was supported by the results of this study. Some significant differences were found however, between the treatment groups on the five individual elements on the POCA Scale.

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis One tested the impact the method of feedback would have on the performance. The results did not provide a significant difference between the computer and handwritten treatment groups on their final "total" speech performance.

Students who received computer-generated feedback were:

- significantly better on their vocal quality skills
- significantly better on their gestural quality skills
- scored higher on organization skills
- scored higher on style skills
- scored lower on development skills

It appears that students who received feedback by the computer method were able to improve most on those speech elements that are easily observable on the videotape. Elements like voice pitch, volume, and rate and gestural quality which are more easily observed on the videotape could be more easily modeled. Bandura (1976) believes that those behaviors that are observed to be effective or rewarding for others, such as the easily observable voice and gestural qualities, are retained more than those that have negative consequences. Since both of these speech skills are more readily observed, it may be easier for the student to accurately observe and retain acceptable performances both from the modeled speeches and their own performances. The idea that an instructor commenting on a speaker's inadequacies that are directly related to one's self-image and observed by classmates, may in some way be received less personally and more objectively when received by the relevantly impersonal computer comments compared to an instructor's handwritten notes. The corrective feedback provided by the impersonal, atomistic comments delivered via the computer may not be considered a personal attack

on the student's self-image and self-esteem. On the other hand the handwritten comments written on the speech evaluation form may be received less constructively by the student. The handwritten comments may have a negative affect on the student's interpretations of the feedback because it may contain more personal comments.

Hypothesis Two

The second hypotheses tested the impact the time at which feedback was provided, relevant to when a student viewed the videotape, would have on the speech performance. The results did not provide a significant difference between the before and after treatment groups on their "total" speech performance. One can conclude that the time at which a student views their speech performance and when they receive feedback does not affect their "total" speech performance.

Scores on the individual elements on the POCA Scale indicate that students who received feedback before viewing their performance on videotape were:

- significantly better on style skills
- scored higher on organization skills
- scored higher on development skills
- scored lower on vocal quality skills
- scored lower on gestural quality skills

One can conclude that a student who receives feedback before viewing their videotape perhaps examines and critiques their tape more closely based on the instructor's comments. Since the elements of style, organization, and development are not easily observed, providing the instructor feedback before viewing the performance may permit the student to critically examine these more "cognitive" aspects of their speech that they may not be able to observe, model, and correct without instructor feedback.

One could conclude that the computer-mediated method of providing feedback does benefit the student as much, if not more so than the handwritten feedback. The computer-mediated feedback method also provides a more manageable, consistent, and efficient method for delivering theory based feedback.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Limitations of the study were considered in relation to research design and measurement techniques. One limiting factor of this study is the selection of the final speech for data collection. Since this speech was only one to two minutes in length, it inherently restricts a student's ability to provide evidence of development and supporting material, limiting the student's ability to demonstrate more than simple Organization and Style. This may also limit the opportunity for the raters to detect any improvements that may have occurred due to the treatments. Improvements that perhaps could be detected on longer speeches. The short speech assignment does favor Vocal and Gestural Quality. A second limitation of the study is the quality of the instructor feedback comments. This list was generated based on the combined years of speech teaching experience of the nine participating faculty. Although it does represent the type and form of instructor comments that are being used in the classroom it could be developed with more attention to theory based objectives.

Another limitation of the study is found in the measurement tool. The POCA Scale places many individual speech traits under one of five categories or elements. This limits, to some extent, the ability to determine exactly which traits are improving more than others.

In summary, given the limitations discussed in this section, generalization of results to other speech courses without careful consideration of the specificity of the speech assignments used in this course should be avoided. Since this is one of the first studies that attempts to quantify the effect of mediated feedback on speech performance, much more research needs to be conducted to determine the efficacy of the method.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Analysis of the results of this study led to the following conclusions:

1. The construct of modeling speech behavior and one's self-analysis of speech performance appears to be beneficial in improving those speech skill traits that are easily observed, such as; Style, Vocal, and Gestural Qualities.
2. The computer feedback method is more helpful than the handwritten feedback method in improving those observable speech skills; Style, Vocal Quality, and Gestural Quality.
3. Neither treatment appears to be significantly better in improving speaking skills on the non-observable speech skills, Organization and Development.
4. Receiving instructor feedback before or after self-analysis of the videotaped speech performance does not appear to significantly benefit either treatment group on improving speech skill.

Replication of the study is encouraged using more complex speech assignments to collect the data. A measurement scale that contains more individual assessments of specific speech skills would help identify specific areas of improvement. A taxonomy based instructor comment file should be developed that more clearly defines levels of competence within each speech objective.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amato, P. P. & Ostermeier, T. H. (1967). The effect of audience feedback on the beginning speaker, The Speech Teacher, 16, 56-60.

Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of model's reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 589-595.

Bandura, A. (1976). Effecting change through participant modeling. In J.D. Krumboltz & C.E. Thorensen (Eds.), Counseling Methods. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 248-264.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Behnke, R. R., & Beatty, M. J. (1979). Critiquing speaker behavior through immediate video display. Communication Education, 26, 345-348.

Behnke, R. R., & King, P. E. (1984), Computerized speech criticism. Communication Education, 33, 173-177.

Behnke, R. R., & O'Hair, H. D. (1984). Applications of high technology to communication instruction. Central States Speech Journal, 35, 171-177.

Behnke, R. R., & Sawyer, C. (1986). Microcomputer feedback in communication training. Educational Technology, 25, 7-11.

Book, C. L. (1985). Providing feedback: The research on effective oral and written feedback strategies. Central States Speech Journal, 36, (Spring/Summer), 14-23.

Book, C. L., & Simmons, K. W. (1980). Dimensions and perceived helpfulness of student speech criticism. Communication Education, 29, 135-145.

Carroll, W.R., & Bandura, A. (1985). Role of timing of visual monitoring and motor rehearsal in observational learning of action patterns. Journal of Motor Behavior.

Cooper, P. J. (1984). Speech Communication for the Classroom Teacher (3rd ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Dedmon, D. N. (1967). Criticizing student speeches: Philosophy and principles. Central States Speech Journal, 18, 276-284.

Diehl, E. R., Breen, M. P., & Larson, C. U. (1970). The effects of teacher comment and television video tape playback on the frequency of nonfluency in beginning speech students. Speech Teacher, 19, 185-189.

Dowrick, P.W. (1983). Self modelling. In P.W. Dowrick & S.J. Biggs (Eds.), Using video: Psychological and social applications (pp. 105-124). London: Wiley.

Frandsen, K. D., Larson, C. E., & Knapp, M. L. (1967, February). Some effects of simultaneous and sequential video-tape playback and instructor comments: A preliminary report. Paper presented at the Conference of the Directors of the Basic Course of the Midwest Universities, Lawrence, Ka.

Hung, J.H., & Rosenthal, T.L. (1981). Therapeutic videotaped playback. In J.L. Fryear & R. Fleshman (Eds.), Videotherapy in Mental Health (pp. 5-46). Springfield, Ill: Thomas.

King, P. E., & Behnke, R. R. (1982). Using immediate feedback to improve speaking skills. Journal of Communication Studies, 1, 1-3.

Klinzing, H.G. & Klinzing, E.G. (1984). The effects of self-confrontation via tv and of additional training components: Group discussion, discrimination training, and practice in a scaled-down situation on the indirectness of teacher trainees. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 23-27.

McCroskey, J. C., & Lashbrook, W. B. (1970). The effect of various methods of employing video-taped television playback in a course in public speaking. The Speech Teacher, 19, 199-205.

Miller, G.R. (1964). Variations in the verbal behavior of a second speaker as a function of varying audience responses. Speech Monographs, 31, 115.

Mulac, A. (1974). Effects of three feedback conditions employing videotape and audiotape on acquired speech skill. Speech Monographs, 41, 205-214.

Nyquist, J. L. & Wulff, D. H. (1982). The use of simultaneous feedback to alter teaching behaviors of university instructors. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 18, 11-18.

Pace, R. C. (1987). A commentary on computer-assisted instruction in speech communication. The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 51, (Winter 1987), 136-141.

Quigley, B. L. & Nyquist, J. D. (1992). Using videotape technology to provide feedback to students in performance courses. Communication Education, 41, 324-334.

Sorenson, R., & Pickett, T. (1986). A test of two teaching strategies designed to improve interview effectiveness: Rating behaviors and videotaped feedback. Communication Education, 35, 13-21.

Sprague, J. A. (1972). An investigation of the written critique behavior of college communication instructors. (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts, 32, 8033.

Vasta, R. (1976). Feedback and fidelity: Effects of contingent consequences on accuracy of imitation. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 21, 98-108.

Young, S. L. (1974). Student perceptions of helpfulness in classroom speech criticism. Speech Teacher, 23, 222-234.

	EXCEPTIONAL A	SUPERIOR B	COMPETENT C	INADEQUATE D	POOR E
ORGANIZATION Introduction Body Conclusion	Introduction actively motivates and engages, making the audience want to hear more; statement of main points are memorable; transitions are varied and appropriate; parts are related to whole; conclusion gives sense of completeness and impact.	Introduction directs attention, reveals topic and establishes credibility; speaker uses topically appropriate divisions; presents a concluding summary which clearly and gracefully ends presentation.	Irrelevant introductory comments; disjointed, unclear statements; order of main points inadequate, confusing; conclusion abrupt, unrelated to topic.		
DEVELOPMENT Variety and number of supporting materials	Reflects an unusual, insightful, novel or unexpected analysis with well selected memorable examples which are especially apt and well-adapted to audience.	Uses clearly related examples to illustrate points; balanced among types; appropriate to purpose; adequate in number and scope.	Support material is weak or speaker's statements unrelated to main points; support materials insufficient in number or quality; support attempts to confuse rather than clarify main points.		
STYLE Language choice Vocabulary Grammar	Grammar is technically perfect and free from error; vocabulary is accurate, reflects carefully chosen vivid and memorable language. Vivid language uses effective imagery and sustained metaphor which unifies speech; memorable language uses such devices as alliteration or grammatical parrallels, etc.	Language is accurate and clear, grammar is correct but simple; word choice reflects sufficient variety to maintain listener interests.	Speaker uses incorrect grammar and elementary vocabulary, cliches, slang, unclear or inaccurate language.		
VOCAL QUALITY Volume, rate, pitch variety; Articulation Enunciation Expressivess	Voice displays controlled tempo, rate, and rhythm; conveys ideas with emphasis, is natural, clearly related to speaker's intention; can be easily heard; sustains attention and involvement of hearers.	Speech is flowing, loud, free of vocalizations; using clear, distinct pronunciation. Voice reflects speaker interest and attracts and maintains listener attention.	Speech is hesitant, erratic in rate; marked by non-fluencies and vocalized pauses; volume is inadequate; garbled pronunciation; devoid of expression; speaker uses monotone or extreme variations in tone or pitch.		
GESTURAL QUALITY Posture, stance Movement Eye contact Head, hand, arm gestures	Speaker is poised, using the body to enhance meaning, with gestures and movements which call attention to important points in natural engaging ways; posture and stance are relaxed yet appropriately energetic; gaze involves audience with speaker and topic.	Speaker's posture is upright, relaxed but stable; gestures are smooth and natural; eye contact is frequent and direct.	Stance is stiff, awkward; speaker assumes a nervous posture or slouches, slumps; avoids eye contact; gestures are wooden, artificial or absent.		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Communication 200

USE OF VOICE (Check the appropriate blank):

Pitch level: too high _____ too low _____ OK _____

Variation of pitch: varied_____ monotonous to a degree_____
very monotonous_____

Rate: too fast_____ too slow_____ OK_____

Variation of rate: too little_____ too much_____ OK_____

Loudness: too loud_____ too soft_____ OK_____

Variation of loudness: too little_____ too much_____ OK_____

Pronunciation: generally correct_____ frequently faulty_____

Enunciation (distinctness): clear_____ slurring_____

VISUAL ASPECTS OF DELIVERY (Check the appropriate blank):

Posture: alert, but at ease_____ all weight on one foot_____
stiff_____ leaning on lectern (furniture, wall)_____
shifting weight constantly_____

Gestures: too few_____ too many_____ appropriate number_____

Quality of gestures: properly motivated_____ affected_____
clumsy_____

Movements: immobile_____ distracting_____ satisfactory in
quality and quantity_____

Facial expressions: very animated_____ occasionally
animated_____ never animated_____

Eye contact: looked at everyone_____ favored one section_____
avoided audience_____

SPEECH TWO EVALUATION FORM

SPEAKER_____ INSTRUCTOR_____ SECTION____ GROUP___

OBJECTIVES OF SPEECH TWO:

1. You must secure your group's approval of a preparation outline for an INFORMATIVE SPEECH, including in your outline all of the components on the Speech Outline Format provided in the student handbook. (See Lucas, pp. 190-197.)

2. You must give an informative speech on an OBJECT, PROCESS, EVENT or CONCEPT (Lucas, Chapter 13) turning in to your instructor at the time of your speech a full sentence preparation outline and a speaking outline. (See Lucas, pp.198-202.)

3. You must deliver the speech as planned so that the listener can accurately write the specific purpose and thesis statement and clearly discern the arrangement pattern of the speech (using one of the arrangement patterns for informative speeches, Lucas, Chapter 13.)

4. You must select and adapt your methods of INFORMING (Lucas, pp. 284-293) to your target audience, identified on the speech outline.

5. You must use one of the attention gaining devices presented in your text to introduce a thesis statement for an INFORMATIVE SPEECH.

6. You must establish your credibility with the audience in the introduction and throughout the speech (Lucas, pp. 319-323).

7. You must forecast or preview the main points of your speech in the introduction.

8. You must provide oral transitions between main points and use other emphases to assist the listener in following your reasoning.

9. You must use and orally cite at least three of the types of supporting materials specified in Lucas, Chapter 6, taken from at least three different sources, selecting and adapting evidence and support to meet your informative purpose with the audience.

Communication 200

10. You must use an organizational method and pattern appropriate to your topic and the audience (See Lucas, pp. 150-157 and 274-284.)

11. You must use sound reasoning and avoid logical fallacies.

12. Your conclusion must include a summary of the main points of your speech.

13. Your conclusion It must reinforce the central idea and signal the end of your speech.

14. You must speak clearly and distinctly in a well modulated, conversational manner using appropriate vocal variety in rate, pitch and volume.

15. You must use language appropriately (good vocabulary and grammar; avoidance of slang, trite expressions, non-fluencies, etc.)

16. You must exhibit good speaking posture: standing erect, not leaning on podium, no distracting moves, using gesture in a way that is effective, appropriate and relevant to the content of the speech.

17. You must speak extemporaneously (i.e., not tied to notes, not memorized, not using a manuscript), maintaining eye contact with the audience rather than notes, walls, visual aids, etc.

18. You must finish the speech within the 3-4 minute time range.

LETTER GRADE AND POINTS ASSIGNED: A B C D F

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: